



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## Synopses of Important Articles.

---

THE COMPOSITION OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL. By PROFESSOR GEORGE A. BARTON, in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. XVII, Part I (1898), pp. 62-86.

Since Porphyry at the end of the third century advanced the theory that the book of Daniel was composed by a Palestinian Jew in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, this book has been the center of much discussion. With hesitation do I present the results of a comparatively comprehensive study of the questions clustering about this unique production.

"That Daniel is an apocalypse and not a prophecy is now so generally accepted as to need no proof. That it is a product of the Maccabæan and not of the exilic age has been so abundantly demonstrated by others that it may pass without further discussion." But attempts to mark differences of authorship in Daniel have not met signal success. During the last two centuries scholars have occupied two camps on the unity and non-unity of the book of Daniel, though most scholars today hold firmly to the unity of the book. Modern scholars, with the exception of Bertholdt, base the analyses of Daniel on the difference of form which appears when chaps. 1-6 are compared with chaps. 7-12. Chaps. 1-6 speak of Daniel in the third person, while chaps. 7-12 are visions which Daniel himself recounts in the first person. Bertholdt has come nearer than any other scholar, unless it be Lagarde, to an appreciation of the real character of the book, though he was in error in assigning widely different dates to different parts and in finding the work of too many authors in the book. On the whole, the best explanation of the presence of two languages is that now accepted by several scholars, who hold that it was written in Hebrew, and that then the author, or some friend of his, issued an Aramaic edition. Later, after a part of the Hebrew edition was lost during a persecution, the deficiency was supplied from the Aramaic version. This duality of language cannot, therefore, be urged in favor of a duality of authorship.

The analysis of the book presents many fine problems. Chap. 1 is a preface to the rest of the book. Chap. 2 recounts Nebuchadnezzar's

dream of the great composite image—representative of the history of the successive empires down to the Ptolemaic and Seleucid kingdoms. These latter kingdoms are to be conquered by the Jewish people, symbolized under the figure of the stone cut out of the mountain. Chap. 3 (Aram. vss. 1–30) narrates how Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego were cast into a burning fiery furnace for refusing to worship the great image set up by Nebuchadnezzar, their deliverance, a decree in favor of their God, and their promotion. This chapter is distinguished from the rest of the book by the unaccountable absence of Daniel. Indeed, one is strongly tempted to believe that this little story originated independently of the Daniel stories and formed part of a somewhat different cycle of tradition. But we hold our judgment in suspense. Chap. 4 (Aram. 3: 31—4: 34) contains Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the tree cut down by divine decree, and Daniel's interpretation of the dream. This chapter bears the stamp of the same literary mint as chap. 2. Chap. 5 describes Belshazzar's feast, the handwriting on the wall, Daniel's interpretation, and the destruction of Belshazzar's kingdom. Chap. 2 was supposedly written when the onslaught of Antiochus was first made; chap. 4, when some lull in the contest gave Israel hope that the heart of the persecutor might be humbled; chap. 5, when the contest was renewed again, and it was evidently a fight to the death. Chap. 6 transports us to the reign of Darius the Mede, and recounts the story of Daniel and the lions' den. While the setting of chap. 3 is Babylonian, that of chap. 6 is Median—the two chapters represent independent parallel traditions.

Chap. 7 takes us back to the reign of Belshazzar and a dream of Daniel, and, like chaps. 2, 4, and 5, gives us a Babylonian environment, and, as in chaps. 2 and 4, employs the device of an apocalyptic dream. Chap. 8 contains Daniel's vision of the ram, who is overcome by the he-goat with the notable horn between his eyes. This vision, like those of chaps. 2, 4, and 7, is embodied in weird imagery unlike anything in Daniel outside of these chapters. Chap. 9 tells of Daniel's vision, in which Jeremiah's seventy years are interpreted as seventy weeks of years, and the events of the last half are made known to him in some detail. "The formal beginning of this chapter, its Median setting, and its unique dependence upon and use of other parts of the Old Testament lead me to believe that it came from an author different from the author of any other chapter except 6: 2–29." The last three chapters form a continuous vision, of which chap. 10 is the introduction. Daniel, fasting by the banks of the Tigris in the third year of Cyrus,

is visited by a heavenly messenger, who unfolds to him the history of the future. The subsequent history of Persia is passed over in a sentence. The author evidently knew of but four Persian kings, probably those who happen to be mentioned in the Old Testament. The Syro-Egyptian history he knows quite thoroughly, and gives it in chap. 11 in great detail. In chap. 12 he tells how Michael shall appear, many dead shall be raised, and the long-expected time of blessedness begin.

As results of our investigation I would mention nine complete episodes after the first chapter. Seven of these are apocalyptic in character, while two (2, 6) are stories for the times. Chap. 1 is but an introduction to these stories. It is clear that such a book can have little unity of plan. These separate and complete episodes, concerning so many reigns, were once, as Lagarde suggested, independent pamphlets. Several of them must be successive efforts of the same author, though they cannot all be from the same pen. This view is confirmed by the fact that every known apocalypse, unless Daniel be an exception, is composite in structure. Each episode of our book fits the great crisis through which the Jews were passing during the years 168-165 B. C.

On a close examination of the book we find in Daniel the work of three, and possibly of four, authors besides an editor. We shall call this editor A. He wrote the pamphlets embodied in chaps. 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8. Possibly on the ground of style and coloring chap. 3 should be ascribed to him also. Another writer (B) conceives of Daniel as living in the reign of Darius the Mede. This author produced pamphlets embodied in chaps. 9 and 6. A third (C) conceives of Daniel as living under Cyrus, and produced the apocalypse chaps. 10: 1-12: 4. Possibly chap. 3, which, on grounds of style, accords with the writings of A, should be assigned to a different writer. We might provisionally call him A<sup>2</sup>.

These writers produced their pamphlets contemporaneously, or nearly so, in different centers for the comfort of their brethren. Soon after the struggle was over, or during its later stages, some editor gathered these pamphlets together, hastily wrote chap. 1 as a preface, inserted a few editorial notes here and there, and appended 12: 5-10, 13 as a conclusion. The editor's plan was to group the narratives about his heroes.

Whatever objections can be urged against the theory here proposed vanish in the presence of facts, of current methods pursued in the investigation of other biblical literature, and of recognized principles of literary criticism.

## A HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS. V.

By PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY, in the *Expositor*, October, 1898.<sup>1</sup>

(24) Greek law in Galatian cities. Paul's teaching as to adoption and heirship implied that the people to whom he wrote lived in a region in which the old native condition of society had been replaced by Roman civilization. Paul must, therefore, have been addressing churches situated in cities and not in the rural portion of Asia Minor. Further, the people whom he addressed were familiar with Greek rather than Roman procedure, a fact which implies that the country must have been one in which Greek law must have formerly ruled. This could not have been true of Galatia proper, where Roman principles of organization were superinduced directly on the old social customs without an intervening Greek period. It becomes evident, therefore, that the epistle was not addressed to people of Gallic origin, but to the Greek cities of eastern Asia.

(25) The metaphor in Romans 4:11. The objection will perhaps be made that the figure in Rom. 4:11, addressed to the people living in Rome, implies that the similar figure in Galatians should be addressed to those who lived under Roman law. But the analogy between the language of Galatians and Romans here is only apparent. Paul attempts to express the same idea in both letters in different ways. The metaphor in each case is chosen to suit the reader: for the Galatians a metaphor founded on Greek law, for the Romans one founded on the customary wide (Roman) usage of the word *pater*, in the sense of chief, master, leader.

(26) "Those of faith." This phrase and the opposite, "those of circumcision," can be traced until they gradually hardened into almost technical terms and badges of two opposite parties. Evidently Paul had used these sayings in his former preaching to the Galatians, for they are quoted as familiar. He must already, therefore, have insisted on the distinction between justification by faith and by the works of the law. In Romans he is more engaged in setting forth the gospel to those not already familiar with these terms. He is especially concerned in proving that faith is not merely *one* element in the reception of righteousness, but the essential and the only element. Both Paul and the Judaizers were Christians. The difference between them was that the latter held that the law and circumcision were indispensable to the fullest stages of righteousness. By the time that the Acts was

<sup>1</sup> See the BIBLICAL WORLD, July, 1898, pp. 54-5; August, pp. 117-19; September, pp. 204-6; October, pp. 278-80.

written its author understood the two opposing parties were clearly understood by the two names.

(27) Galatians 3:15-18. An illustration from the ordinary facts of society as it existed in the Galatian cities here stated. *διαθήκη* is used in the sense of a will, not a mere covenant. In this sense it is found in many inscriptions. But this does not mean a will as understood in modern law. It was rather an arrangement by which the testator sought to maintain a family with religious obligation, and if it included bequests of money to the state, it was for the sake of the honor and the privileges of the testator and his family. Such a will, when it had been once duly executed, could not be revoked by a subsequent act of the testator. The appointment of an heir was the adoption of a son, and was irrevocable in Galatian territory. In Roman law such a will had been abandoned, but in Greek law and in Galatian law its character was retained. The Græco-Syrian lawbook exactly lays down principles that a man can never put away an adopted son, although he could put away a real son upon good ground. But with this sense the northern Galatia could hardly have been acquainted. The use of the term in Romans is not the same as that in Galatians. It is to be noticed that in vs. 15 Paul does not say that a supplementary will cannot be made, but that it cannot interfere or invalidate the old will. For the inheritance is not merely a claim to property, but was the right to take the father's place in all his relations to the gods and the state, and two or more sons could take the father's place jointly, each being an heir.

The archæological discussion of *διαθήκη* is of the greatest importance and deserves careful consideration, even if at first glance it may seem as if Professor Ramsay were arguing a bit too ingeniously in his distinction between Galatians and Romans. If his position should be correct, it would remove many difficulties now connected with Paul's thought at this point. It does not, however, compel the adoption of the interpretation of the *σπέρμα* argument concerning which doubts were expressed in the October number of this journal.

S. M.

---

THE ACCREDITED PRINCIPLES OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM. By A. C. ZENOS, D.D., in the *Homiletic Review*, October, 1898, pp. 300-306.

In considering this subject, the first question to be answered is: How are principles accredited? This is a matter of growth. Such principles emerge through a process of instinctive selection, causing the worthless to be set aside and the true to be disengaged. While for

complete accrediting universal acceptance is required, yet sporadic and isolated exceptions, rising usually out of eccentricity, do not invalidate these principles. The universally accepted principles of the higher criticism are difficult to disengage, because of the greatness and complexity of the literature involved. Another difficulty lies in the fact that these principles are being worked out by controversy instead of by friendly investigation of all parties. Still, the following principles can be regarded as accredited: (1) The literary features of a document may be employed as criteria of its origin. This can be done only under given conditions and certain limitations. (2) The historical setting of a document can be employed to identify the origin of a document. The critic, however, should pay due regard to the demand that what he calls historical facts and factors shall not be simply inventions of his own imagination. (3) The religious thought characterizing a document may be used as a criterion of its origin. This is based on the fact of development. The danger here is from the temptation to impart some unphilosophic theory of evolution. (4) The corroboration and support given by the union of these principles are of such value that, if they stand together in opposition to tradition, it may be fairly assumed that tradition is in error.

This is a cautiously worded article, which, however, reveals with sufficient clearness the logical basis of criticism. It is desirable, in emphasizing the validity of criticism, to place in the other scale the dangers to which it is liable. The judicial mind of Professor Zenos has done this admirably, and the reader cannot but receive the impression that, while criticism is a thoroughly scientific affair, it would better be left to the library and laboratory of the trained scholar, and not be invited into the pulpit, or dabbled in by every half-baked student.

G. S. G.

---

A "STRIKING MONOTONY" IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.—The historical picture of the synoptists and that of John are not mutually exclusive in their portrayal of Jesus' Messianic claim and its recognition. The Johannine monotony which makes Jesus, when in conflict with the religious leaders, resort to unqualified self-assertion from the beginning to the end of his ministry has its counterpart in the synoptics whenever Jesus appears in similar circumstances.

In the synoptics the more mature and enlightened confession of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi (Mark 8:27-30) marks the turning-point in the ministry. But the synoptics do not indicate that Jesus arrived late at the knowledge of his own Messiahship. This self-seclusion

may have been adopted to induce men to form an opinion of him on the basis of his works alone. The multitudes early tried to classify Jesus (Matt. 12:23), but were estranged by his refusal to meet their gross idea of the kingdom (John 6:15, 66).

The synoptics record increasing conflict with the religious leaders from the very beginning (Mark 1:21 ff.; 2:1—3:6), and in this conflict we have the same self-assertion and exalted claim on the part of Jesus that John records for him under similar circumstances. Is this "conflict group" (Mark 2:1—3:6) chronologically out of order? Apparent artificialness, and the statement of Papias, "The presbyter said: 'Mark having become the interpreter of Peter wrote down accurately, though *not indeed in order* (οὐ μέντοι τάξει), whatsoever he remembered of the things said or done by Christ,'" indicate that topical arrangement may have controlled. But this cannot be admitted for the rest of Mark, and the kernel of this group must have some natural connection with the incidents in the midst of which it is placed. Ripe grain (Mark 2:23) indicates that the first Sabbath controversy was in the spring, *i. e.*, a year before the Passion, and if Mark 6:39 (ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χρότῳ) sustains the statement of John 6:4 that the feeding of the five thousand was at a Passover season, then this Sabbath controversy took place the second spring before the Passion; or, denying this, a reason for the dislocation of this incident from Mark 7:1—23 must be given.

At least the cure of the paralytic, the call of Levi, and the first Sabbath controversy are correctly placed; and it is certain that Jesus' early Galilean activity met official opposition, such as called forth his self-assertion and high personal claims. The title "Son of Man" (Mark 2:28) must have some of the exalted conception that it had in the older Hebrew and later Syriac, and that distinguished it from "Man." Note this same exalted self-assertion in Mark 2:10. His personal consciousness of his mission was clear from the time of his baptism and temptation at least.

The failure of the people at large to grasp the Messianic meaning of the title "Son of Man," as used by Jesus, may have been due to the contradiction between their transcendental concept of the term and the humble life of the Nazarene; or, the multitudes may not have been familiar with the Messianic import of the title. To those who understood it Jesus was a profound problem. Thus the early self-assertion and claim are not contradictory to the development up to a definite self-declaration at the close of the Galilean period. He endeavored



to suppress the heralding abroad of his cures in Galilee, lest there should be a fanatical zealot uprising. Conclusions: (a) The positive aspect of the Galilean ministry was the preaching of the kingdom by word and deed; the negative, the growing opposition of the religious leaders. (b) In relation to the multitudes he hid behind his message, that men might draw their conclusions about him as soon as they reached a just idea of his conception of the kingdom. (c) Whenever opposed by the religious leaders he met the opposition with uncompromising self-assertion and exalted personal claim. (d) Under similar circumstances Jesus assumes the same attitude in the synoptics and fourth gospel.—RUSH RHEES, in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1898, Vol. XVII, Part I.

THE AID OF CRITICISM IN THE INTERPRETATION OF THE PSALMS.—The advantages of biblical criticism are nowhere so numerous and so manifest as in the interpretation of the Psalms. For modern criticism the "I" of the Psalms is "a personification of the congregation of the pious, or a pious man who speaks in the name of all the pious." This view is made possible by dating the greater part of the Psalter after the advent of Jeremiah; and by thus bringing them into connection with the thoughts and feelings of the later Israelites, the Psalms become much clearer and deeper.

*Psalms 8*.—A guide to the true interpretation is furnished by the emphasis laid upon the national thought at the beginning and the end of this psalm ("our Lord"). The author's purpose is not philosophical, but practical, viz., to strengthen his people's faith in Israel's destiny. Israel had been vanquished and despised by great nations, but through all its reverses it still hoped to assume lordship over the rest of the world. So it is in nature: man in comparison with the heavens is insignificant, yet he stands like a god in the rest of the world. This interpretation brings the psalm into close relation with Isaiah, chap. 53, and sheds much light on the use of it in Heb. 2:6 ff.

*Psalms 2 and 18*.—In Ps. 2 the anointed of the Lord cannot be a foreign king, nor one of the Hasmonean line, nor a pre-exilic king; against this latter view are the Aramaic language of the song and its freedom from any definite historical setting. Nor is the psalm Messianic, for nowhere else is the Messiah represented as speaking. It has, rather, a historical motive, as is seen by the possibility presented to the heathen of saving themselves from the judgment of God. It is post-exilic and designates Israel itself as the anointed of the Lord. It

thus joins on to other passages in which the people appears as heir of the Davidic kingship (Isa. 55; Ps. 89; 84:10; Hab. 3:13). It is again, as in Ps. 8, a question of world-dominion. The case is the same with Ps. 18. Davidic authorship cannot be maintained in view of vss. 21 ff. Thought of world-dominion crops out in vss. 44 ff. However, no definite historical motive is revealed; it is a purely ideal picture with which to arouse the enthusiasm of the pious.

*Psalms 1, 19, and 24.*—These and similar psalms presuppose the existence of the written law, and lay much stress upon its moral and religious elements. The ceremonial regulations are symbols of religious thought and so furnish the pious with a fruitful field of study. The law is a spiritual world into which the pious may plunge and there find rest from the fearful pressure of the external world, while others are overcome and lose faith in a just God. The contribution of such psalms to the history of post-exilic Judaism is invaluable.

*Psalms 15.*—This is the picture of a true Israelite, as he was conceived of at the time Psalms were written. An instructive comparison may be instituted between this and ideals held up by other Old Testament writers, *e. g.*, Ezek. 18:5 ff.; Job 31; Isa. 33:15; Ps. 24:4.—FRANTS BUHL, in the *American Journal of Theology*, October, 1898.

THE PROPHECY OF MALACHI.—It may be assumed that the prophecy is anonymous. It may fall into two main divisions: (1) a rebuke addressed to the priests (1:2—2:9); (2) a series of oracles addressed to all the people, consisting mainly of charges brought against priest and layman alike (2:10—3:21). In addition to other features, this brief, and at first sight not altogether attractive, composition gives us in small compass a many-sided view of the religious conditions in which the writer lived. As for the date of Malachi, this much seems certain that it was written at some time in the Persian period (allusion to the "governor" in 1:8) after the completion of the temple (3:10)—possibly in the first half of the fourth century. The diction of Malachi is pure; the style vigorous, though often prosaic and awkward. Originality and earnestness are marked characteristics of the book in all its parts.—C. C. TORREY, in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. XVII, pp. 1-16.